



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

12

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/758,070

01/14/2004

Douglas Lee

ADAPP263

5089

25920

7590

10/20/2006

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE
SUITE 200
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

EXAMINER

FERRIS III, FRED O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2128

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/758,070	Applicant(s) LEE ET AL.	
	Examiner Fred Ferris	Art Unit 2128	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/14/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 have been presented for examination based on applicant's disclosure filed 14 January 2004. Claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application and stand rejected by the examiner.

Drawings

2. The drawings (Figs. 3A-E) are objected to because they are informal and therefore acceptable for examination purposes only. New formal drawings will be required when claims are allowed.

The drawings are further objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing all of the claimed elements. The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the features must be shown or the features canceled from the claims. No new matter should be entered.

Specifically, system claims 12 - 20 include limitations reciting logic for extracting, storing, and inputting parameters that are not disclosed in the drawings.

MPEP Section 608.02(d) [R-2] "Complete Illustration in Drawings" recites the following:

"37 CFR 1.83. Content of drawing.

(a) The drawing in a nonprovisional application must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. However, conventional features disclosed in the description and claims, where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention, should be illustrated in the drawing in the form of a graphical drawing symbol or a labeled representation"

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103/102

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent 7,103,860 issued to Price et al.

Regarding independent claim 1: Price teaches method for testing a development device by extracting device parameters from a product specification (CL7-L29-37, CL8-L44-53), storing the parameters in a testing data file (CL7-L41), inputting the test file into a test bench (i.e. device under test (DUT)) coupled to device, and testing the device (CL11-L25-43, Figs. 4-7).

In the alternative, claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious in view of U.S. Patent 6,760,888 issued to Killian et al.

Killian specifically teaches a test bench (external to the DUT) coupled to the device (CL24-L33-54, Figs. 2, 8) and hence would have knowingly been incorporated by a skilled artisan motivated by the need to automatically configure processor test devices based on specification inputs for an external device (Killian CL6-L19-33).

Per claims 2-7: Price further discloses receiving product specification and changing formats (CL7-L51-58), a text format (CL7-42), and operational test parameters

(CL13-L1-CL14-L63) relating development of device by registers including parameters (e.g., size, location, etc.).

Per claims 8-11: Killian discloses header and footer table/file storing parameters (CL27-L33-47), name and location (by necessity), while rearranging parameters, simulated device (CL7-L51-58) are disclosed by Price.

4. Claims 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7,103,860 issued to Price et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,760,888 issued to Killian et al.

Regarding independent claims 12 and 20: As noted above, Price renders obvious the elements relating to testing a development device by extracting device parameters from a product specification (CL7-L29-37, CL8-L44-53), storing the parameters in a testing data file (CL7-L41), inputting the test file into a test bench (i.e. device under test (DUT)) coupled to device, and testing the device (CL11-L25-43, Figs. 4-7) inclusive of the required system logic (Figs. 1, 3, 4).

Price does not explicitly set forth that system includes an external test bench.

However, analogous art Killian specifically teaches a test bench (external to the DUT) coupled to the device (CL24-L33-54, Figs. 2, 8) also including logic for inputting test files and testing the device. (Fig. 2, CL24-L33-54)

It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Price with the teachings of Killian to realize the claimed elements of the present invention. Killian provides sufficient motivation for

combination of references in setting forth the need to automatically configure processor test devices based on specification inputs for an external device (Killian CL6-L19-33).

Per claim 13: Killian teaches test bench system access via a computer network (CL10-L64).

Per claims 14-18: Price renders obvious the elements relating to logic for receiving product specification (CL7-L51-58), operational test parameters (CL13-L1-CL14-L63) relating development of device by registers including parameters and test. Killian also teaches logic for inputting test files and testing the device (Fig. 2, 8, CL24-L33-54).

Per claim 19: Killian discloses a simulated development device (CL7-L14-26, Fig. 8).

Conclusion

6. *The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure, careful consideration should be given prior to applicant's response to this Office Action.*


U.S. Patent 6,862,717 issued to Nadeau-Dostie et al teaches testing of a simulated development device.

"Automating Functional Coverage Analysis Based on and Executable Specification", Regimbal et al, Proceedings 3rd International Workshop on SoC, 2003 IEEE, teaches testing from extracted specification parameters.

Art Unit: 2128

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred Ferris whose telephone number is 571-272-3778 and whose normal working hours are 8:30am to 5:00pm Monday to Friday. Any inquiry of a general nature relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-3700. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah can be reached at 571-272-2279. The Official Fax Number is: (571) 273 8300.

Fred Ferris, Primary Examiner
Simulation and Emulation, Art Unit 2128
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Randolph Building, Room 5D19
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22313
Phone: (571-272-3778)
Fred.Ferris@uspto.gov
October 16, 2006


FRED FERRIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100